

1915
B817

BROWN

The I. W. W. Movement

Economics

A. B.

1915

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

1915
B817





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/iwwmovement00brow>

THE I. W. W. MOVEMENT

BY

PEMBROKE HOLCOMB BROWN

THESIS

FOR THE

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS

IN

ECONOMICS

IN

THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

1915

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

May 29 1915

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION BY

Pembroke Holcomb Brown

ENTITLED The I. W. W. Movement

IS APPROVED BY ME AS FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF Bachelor of Arts in Economics

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Ralph G. Herlihan

Instructor in Charge

APPROVED:...

Ernest H. Newsump

a/c HEAD OF DEPARTMENT OF

Economics

James M. H. H.

James M. H. H.



1915
B817

TABLE OF CONTENTS

-*-

I	Introduction.....	Page 1
II	The I. W. W., Its History and Organization.....	9
III	The Social Program of the I. W. W.....	16
IV	The Weapons of the I. W. W.....	29
V	The Future of the Movement.....	39
	Bibliography.....	44
	Appendix A.....	47
	Appendix B.....	53

THE I. W. W. MOVEMENT

I

Introduction.

To understand the I. W. W. movement, and to appreciate its possibilities and limitations it is necessary to have some knowledge of the greater organization of which the I. W. W. is but a part. Organized Syndicalism is a world power. In it there is little that is really new either of propaganda or philosophy; it is an amalgam of many movements that have gone before. It tells of golden age, not in a distant past; but in the very immediate future, of a time when the might power of labor will have raised itself, and by a masterful effort will have conquered the evils of the present industrial struggle, and will have ushered in an era of industrial peace. The spirit of the movement is well expressed in a few lines of the ancient poet Omar:

".....could you and I but once conspire
To grasp the mighty scheme of things entire,
Would we not smash the thing to bits, and then
Remould it nearer to our heart's desire."

For the Syndicalist there is to be a long period of preparation, a clash of powers terrible though short, and then the quiet reorganization of society into a perfect industrial commonwealth.

It is but natural that the program of such a movement should appeal most to those who have nothing to lose

by the breaking up of the present system; to those who have no strong sense of family and to whom it means little that their descendants will be better off than they themselves can hope to be; to those, too, who are at the bottom of the industrial system, and to whom the industrial battle would come as a welcome break in a weary round of toil. Such make up the great mass of the Syndicalists. They are men to whom cold reason means little; but they feel keenly the injustice and wrongs of their present condition, and they have the primal instinct to take matters into their own hands, and to better themselves by force if that be possible. There are, too, the enthusiastic propagandists, the philosophers, the astute leaders; among these there are many of more than ordinary ability.

The most careful and dispassionate definition of Syndicalism that I have found was written by John Spargo;- "Syndicalism is a form of labor unionism which aims at the abolition of the capitalist system based upon the exploitation of the workers, and its replacement by a new social order free from class domination and exploitation. Its distinctive ends are to be attained by direct action of the unions, without parliamentary action or the intervention of the State. The distinctive feature of its ideal is that in the new social order the political State will not exist, the only form of government being the administration of industry directly by the workers themselves."^①

¹⁾ John Spargo, "Syndicalism, Industrial Unionism and Socialism." Page 13.

Here then we have it: The Socialist doctrine of the class struggle, the Anarchist ideal of society, the Trade Union organization. But though the Syndicalist accepts the doctrine of the class struggle he does not accept the doctrine of economic evolution. To him, the present wrongs are traceable to the innate viciousness of the capitalist class, not to the working out of economic law, and on this tenet of individual responsibility he founds the justification of violence. To him, present law is capitalist law; the worker had no hand in making it, and is not therefore to be blamed for marring it when and how he chooses. Furthermore, since the capitalist assumes the right of seizure in exploiting labor, it is but fairness to grant the laborer the right of reprisal. The Syndicalist rejects, too, the Socialist doctrine of the nationalization of industry. He sees the Socialists as the party of state capitalism. Their principals of state enterprise, order, discipline, hierarchy, subordination, maximum productivity, are the same as those of the hated capitalist. Can such bring industrial happiness? The Syndicalist says, "No". The trade unions too are criticized. They have sold themselves. They have compromised with the wage system, and for a present gain in wages and hours have given up their rights as the creators of wealth. Besides this, the present organization of labor unions is such that one union may be pitted against another, and thus the workers themselves may be made to fight the battles of the capitalist employer. It is necessary to organize industrially rather than by trades if the workers are to meet the employer on anything like an

equality.

The most powerful weapon of this new organization is found inherent in the form of organization adopted, i. e. the industrial or all-inclusive union. If the organization is by industries not by trades, it is possible to close a plant absolutely and at any time. Furthermore, by drawing all the locals into one national organization, it becomes possible to control the industry in the entire nation; and by combining the national organizations a grip on the industrial life of the entire country is obtained. The power thus acquired is to be exercised through the general strike.

William Haywood, in writing of the general strike, recognizes three phases: It may be confined to a single industry; it may affect a single community; it may be nation wide.²⁾ Of these, the first two are but trivial. Through such the technic of the strike is to be learned, and its power is to be made known. True, they may result in shorter hours or in higher wages which would be quite acceptable; or it may be defeated, which is unfortunate but of no real significance. All this is but the preparation for the general national strike that is to come. Then industry will cease; and there will be no production until the capitalists give up their ill gained power, and the workers come into their own.

The methods of the general strike are interesting. The workers leave their jobs and keep them too. A strike may be called one day and given up the next. To quit for a

2) William Haywood, "Industrial Socialism" page 47.

few days at the right time might easily cause the manufacturer to fail of delivery on his contracts. A pretext is not necessary; warfare is to be unceasing without truce or quarter. Signed contracts will be unknown or disregarded. It is calculated that such procedure will be very wearing on the nerves of the average capitalist, and that is the desired end. To gain the point at issue if there is any particular point at issue, is of minor importance. The great thing is to hinder and wear out the capitalist producer. It is this attitude that explains why many of the strikes that seem to the general public to be utter failures are hailed by the Syndicalists as victories. Then too, it is relatively easy to destroy the manufactured product, or to spoil the machinery necessary to the running of the factory. This is the doctrine of sabotage. Puget, a leading French Syndicalist, thus explains sabotage: "If a worker is badly paid, and returns bad work for bad pay, he is a saboteur." It is easy to introduce petrol into a kneeding trough, and to spoil the composition of steel needs but the introduction of a few chemicals. In fact, a skillful saboteur might by keeping his job cause more expense and trouble than a whole army of strikers out wide the gates of the plant.

These then are the weapons of the Syndicalist: the general strike and sabotage. Their use constitutes direct action as contrasted with the parliamentary action proposed by the Socialists. To the Syndicalist, all government is undemocratic if organized on political lines. There should be no government apart from the necessary direction

of industry. With this conception in mind it is easy to see that reform through state action would be entirely outside the Syndicalist's ken. The workers must struggle for themselves; conquer for themselves; reconstruct for themselves. In this the relation to Anarchism is plainly shown. It is as Robert Hunter has said; "Anarchism is a doctrine of individualism; Syndicalism is a doctrine of working class action.....Syndicalism is included in Anarchism."³

Concerning the future ordering of industrial society the Syndicalists have little definite to say. They admit that there will arise many problems that will be difficult of settlement; but they hold firmly to the faith that their conception of the social order is the only true conception, and that the problems of the future can be solved in the light of the principals they represent. Government is to be a simple matter; there will be few national officers. The locals will be supreme in local affairs, and the national organization will interest itself only in those things of truly national import. The tools will be owned by the workers themselves. Industry will be classified into some four or five departments, and officers chosen by these will dictate the national policy. Thus is developed the pyramid of power; - The local, the national industry, the department, the governing council. So far as I have found, there is no fixed and rather definite plan of organization. The problems of the future are to be solved in the future, and with the knowledge gained by the experiences of the "Revolution".

³ Robert Hunter, "Violence and the Labor Movement" Page 245.

This much is sure: The organization whatever it may be will be economic, not political.

Such then is Syndicalism as it is generally accepted in Europe. The American variety offers some differences. It has been the policy of the French Syndicalists to industrialize unionism by bringing together the craft unions concerned in the same industry. Thus there is but one powerful form of labor union in France. The I. W. W. has not followed the French example, but has broken with the craft unions, and has set up a rival organization. In fact the most bitter enemies of the I. W. W. are to be found in the trade unions. The difference of course was brought about by the fact that in France Syndicalism was a growth, while in America it was superimposed on an organization already powerful, and already provided with a philosophy of reform. It is not likely that the Syndicalists could have gained control of the trade unions here. Certainly it would have required years of agitation and to have carried on such a campaign some kind of organization would have been necessary. It seems that the setting up of a new organization was almost inevitable; but it has been severely criticized by the writers in France and England. In another way the I. W. W. is at odds with the foreign organizations. The American society has seen fit to centralize power in the hands of a national executive. This has doubtless made possible more efficient organization, but it is looked upon with suspicion by many. They see in the powerful individual the germ of a bureaucracy that will rule the society in accordance with its own theories, and will not give free expression to the ideas of others.

Thus then there are no important differences of theory between the Syndicalists of Europe and the I. W. W. Such variations as there are have been dictated by the exigencies of the situation rather than by any desire to depart from the traditions of the movement.

II

The I. W. W. Its History and Organization.

The I. W. W. as a formal organization seems to have taken its beginning in the fall of 1904, when six active workers in the revolutionary labor movement met in Chicago in a conference. These six workers were: Isaak Cowen, the American Representative of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers of Great Britain; Clarence Smith, General Secretary-Treasurer of the American Labor Union; Thomas J. Hagerty, Editor of the "Voice of Labor," official organ of the American Labor Union; George Espes, President of the United Brotherhood of Railway Employees; W. L. Hall, General Secretary-Treasurer of the United Brotherhood of Railway Employees; and William E. Trautmann, Editor of the "Brauer Zeitung", official organ of the United Brewery Workers of America.^① The important work of this conference was to call a meeting of thirty-six individuals who were known to be actively interested in the cause of labor, and who represented the radical labor organizations and Socialistic political organizations of the United States.

Thirty-four of these gentlemen met in Chicago in a secret conference January 2, 1905. Max S. Hayes and Victor Berger declined to attend. This conference drew up and issued the Industrial Union Manifesto,^② and called upon all labor organizations to send delegates to a convention to be

① St. John, "The I. W. W.", page 3.

② See also Appendix A.

held in Chicago June 27, 1905 for the purpose of forming an organization of which this manifesto should be the basis.

This convention assembled with 186 delegates present from thirty-four state, district, national, and local organizations. About 90,000 members were represented. It was recognized that not all of these were in harmony with the principles of the manifesto. There was considerable friction in the matter of credentials and voting power; but an organization was finally effected. Of this, the following became members: Western Federation of Miners, 27,000 members; Socialistic Trade and Labor Alliance, 1,450 members; Punch Press Operators, 186 members; United Metal Workers, 3,000 members; Longshoremen's Union, 400 members; American Labor Union, 16,500 members; United Brotherhood of Railway Employees, 2,087 members. It is likely that the membership in several of the organizations is exaggerated, in fact it is admitted that two, the Socialistic Trade and Labor Alliance and the American Labor Union existed almost wholly on paper.^③ Therefore the total number of working men actually represented was probably not more than 32,673.

At this convention the original I. W. W. "Preamble" was adopted.^④ This document represents a compromise between the Socialists, Anarchists, and Labor Union delegates who fought for mastery of the newly organized I. W. W. It is sufficient to say that this original preamble sounds a note of revolution. It begins with the startling statement that

③ St. John, "The I. W. W." page 5.

④ For the "Preamble" in its final form see Appendix B.

that the working class and the employing class have nothing in common. It recognized the class struggle and criticizes the organization of the trade unions and seeks to remedy the present conditions by the formation of such organizations as will make a general strike possible.

During the first year of its existence, the I. W. W. succeeded in establishing a monthly organ called the "Industrial Worker". The organization gave itself wholeheartedly to the defense of Mr. Moyer, Mr. Haywood, and Mr. Pettibone, the leaders of the Western Federation of Miners, in their trial for murder, etc.

In September 1906 the second convention met with 93 delegates representing about 60,000 members. At this time there came about a struggle which separated the members into two contending camps, the revolutionary and the reactionary. The radical element finally secured control; but the organization was weakened numerically by the struggle. The second convention amended the Preamble by adding a clause expressing their intention to avoid political affiliation.

The convention of 1907 was uneventful; but that of 1908 brought about an open rupture between the Socialistic politicians and industrial unions. At this convention the Preamble was put in its final form, and the organization was officially dedicated to direct action as contrasted with the parliamentarianism of the Socialists.

The membership of the I. W. W. is made up almost wholly of unskilled workers, those which are to be found in the basic industries of the country such as mining, farming,

railroad construction, laboring, and textile manufacturing. The paid up membership of the organization in 1913 was 30,347, but at that time the general office had issued 120,000 membership cards.^⑤ Because of the seasonal nature of some of the industries represented, and because of the fact that workers in these industries are often at great distances from the offices of the I. W. W., and are for a long period out of touch with the organization, it is likely that this membership of 120,000 is nearer the actual strength of the organization than is the smaller number given.

The history of the organization has been, is, and will be one of continual struggle. Besides opposition of its enemies from without, there are grave differences within the organization that are likely to cause disunion in the future as they have in the past. The I. W. W. Preamble represents the common principles that are held by the great mass of the I. W. W. sympathizers, and it is the strength of this document which makes possible the binding together of so many different organizations. Ever since the first year of its existence, the I. W. W. has been conducting strikes. These have been carried on in the characteristic Syndicalist fashion. In many of these struggles the I. W. W. has been successful in obtaining the point at issue. Sometimes it has been shorter hours, and sometimes it has improved working conditions. It is difficult to estimate the value of these struggles to the workers. They have doubtless been of great value to the organization in promoting unity and in teaching its members

⑤ St. John, "The I. W. W." page 36.

how a Syndicalist strike may be carried on successfully. The most important struggles have been the McKees Rocks strike in Pennsylvania in 1909, and the textile workers' strike at Lawrence, Massachusetts in 1912. Both of these strikes were characterized by violence, disorder, and destruction of property, but in general, one cannot say that the I. W. W. has inflicted more violence upon society than the I. W. W. members have suffered from the officers of society itself.

The plan or organization of the I. W. W. has been well summarized by E. S. Nelson thus:

- 1) "All workers in one industry (coal miners for example) in, first, one Local; second, one National; third, one International Industrial Union.
- 2) "All workers in all kindred industrial unions (coal, salt, ore, etc., miners) organically connected in our Industrial Departmental Administration.
- 3) "All workers in all departments connected and integralized in one General Executive Industrial Administration.
- 4) "The membership of the I. W. W. constitutes the Supreme Directing Authority through the general referendum."⁶

The unit of organization is the Local Industrial Union. Because of the differences that exist within the different departments of industry, it has been found advisable in some cases to

⁶Nelson, E. S. "Appeal to Wage Workers" page

divide the Local into Branches. Such divisions may be: Language branches, Shop branches, Departmental branches, District branches. Such divisions have been found to expedite procedure, and to make possible a more regular attendance by those employed in an industry covering a considerable area. District Councils are provided wherever necessary to give unity and solidarity to the District Branches. The form or organization is sufficiently flexible to change as industrial conditions change, and to bring about a concentration of membership as there develops a concentration of industry.

The Locals have full charge of all their local affairs, except that the initiation fee and maximum dues are fixed by the national organization. No Local can charge more than five dollars initiation fee, or more than one dollar a month dues. The intent of the I. W. W. is that the fees shall be so low that they will not prohibit any worker from affiliation with the society.

The National Industrial Unions hold annual conventions, and at these, delegates from the Locals cast a vote based on the membership of the locals represented. The National officers are nominated at the convention; but are elected by a referendum of all the members. The Departmental officers are chosen in a similar way, and the same method is followed in selecting the General Secretary-Treasurer, and the General Organizer, who are officers of the General Organization.

It is the custom to pay the officers approximately the same wages they would receive if employed in the industry in which they have been accustomed to work. This seems a

wise rule, calculated to prevent the developement of the job-holding politician who has done so much to injure the craft unions in the eyes of the public.⁽⁷⁾

The intent of the entire organization is democracy and efficiency. The form selected seems such that it can be bent to conform to any condition that may arise, and the central organization seems strong enough to preserve the necessary unity.

7/ St. John, "The I. W. W." pages 14, 15, 16.

III

The Social Program of the I. W. W.

The program to be followed by the I. W. W. after it shall have obtained control of industries, has never been definitely formulated. The Syndicalist society of the future is to be organized in the light of the experiences of the Syndicalist revolution. There will doubtless arise many problems that will be difficult of solution, and from which there will be no escape; but it is the firm faith of the leaders in the enterprise that these problems can be met and can be solved when such action is necessary. It is but natural that there should be a considerable difference between the future society as seen by the leaders in Syndicalist literature, the interlectuals as they are sometimes called, and the future society as seen by the rank and file of the Syndicalist movement. The great mass of the members of the I. W. W. have no appreciation of the complicated problems that must be solved before any social reorganization can be firmly established. They have no conception of the importance of slight differences of policy. They think in masses and are looking forward to a future rather hazy, but showing the outlines of a few great principles. The fundamental tenet of the I. W. W. is that all wealth is the product of labor, and that labor is entitled to all it produces. The ideal society will be a society in which the realization of these principles is possible. They do not seek equality in wealth; they seek only to assure every man of the possession of all

that he produces.^① But their view of the producer is a very narrow one and in it the capitalist has no place.

It is maintained that there are at present in society, two governments--the political and industrial. The political government is easily seen and is recognized by everyone. To it we look for the assurance of protection of life and property. Its officers are our representatives in the great society of the world. The industrial government, it is held, though less clearly defined is none the less powerful. Its statutes are laws of economics; its battle-grounds are the strikes and lockouts which characterize the industrial life of our nation. The worker, as an individual, is a subject of both of these dominions; and it is the inevitable friction between these two social powers that give rise to much of the social unrest of the present time. All social reformation has been, and is an attempt to harmonize the laws of these two governments. The trade unions would solve the problem by seeking to compromise,--as friction develops, to pour oil on the troubled parts and to seek by legislation to temper the working of the one government with the working of the other. The Socialists would have a more simple solution. They would make the industrial government utterly subservient to and a part of the political government. The nation would replace the capitalist. Thus they would seek harmony. The Syndicalist on the other hand, would replace the political government by an industrial government, and would direct the political life of the nation along such

lines as commend themselves to the industries. All of these different plans recognize practically the same weaknesses in the present day society, and for each of the remedies proposed there is some justification. It is necessary to go a little farther in the consideration of the differences between the propositions.

The I. W. W. criticizes Socialism on the ground that justice to the working man can never be gained by legislative enactment, that the Socialist program of social reorganization is merely the substitution of state capitalism for individual capitalism. The Syndicalists admit that conditions may be ameliorated by wise laws even under the present system of government; but they hold that the underlying causes of the present evils are innate in the capitalistic system, and are not to be reached by any remedy wherein the existence of capitalism is recognized. They point to government ownership as it exists to-day as an example of what we may expect under socialism. They point to the fact that the employees of the United States Post Office are treated worse than many of the employees of private capitalists, that the railway mail clerks are less protected, and work for smaller wages than do the men in the railroad employ.⁽²⁾ They say that all advances of the workers as a class have come through the recognition of the power of the workers to order industry, not through the recognition of the power of the workers to control the government.⁽³⁾ Of course it has happened in many

²/Haywood "Industrial Socialism" page 50.

³/Williams "Eleven Blind Leaders" page 28.

cases that the possession of the former power brought with it the possession of the latter. Under the Socialist system of government ownership, the principles of order, discipline, hierarchy, and maximum productivity will drive the workers as thoroughly as do the same principles under private ownership.⁽⁴⁾ It is only in so far as the workers' power to destroy both the industry and the product is recognized that he has any assurance of safety. The ideal officer under Socialism would be likely to be as driving in the work as is the ideal superintendent of to-day, and would be likely to care just as little for the welfare of the workmen as does the average superintendent of to-day. William Haywood has said: "If the workers had been employed twelve hours a day and forced their employers to grant them a ten hour day, they have passed an important law in the shop."⁽⁵⁾ Professor Ely concluded from the facts at his command in 1886 that an eight hour day would only be obtained by a general refusal to work more than eight hours on the part of the American working class.⁽⁶⁺⁷⁾ Mr. Ettor has said: "But if history teaches aught, we know this much: Right and wrong are relative terms and it all resolves into a question of power--cold, unsentimental power."⁽⁸⁾ The I. W. W. then, believes that remedial legislation is but a reflection of the power of the working class. It must

4) Labriola, Arturo Quoted in "Violence and the Labor
(Movement" Hunter page

5) Haywood "Industrial Socialism" page 52.

6) Williams "Eleven Blind Leaders" page 21. See also

7) Ely "Labor Movement in America".

8) Ettor "Industrial Unionism" page 12.

always follow and can never precede.

Socialism is also criticized as being impractical of realization. All the leading Socialists apparently conceive the transformation as the exclusive task of the Socialist party when it shall obtain control of the governmental machinery of the state, which will be used to legislate or otherwise bring into existence the Socialistic commonwealth. The I. W. W. leaders contend that the Socialist program is entirely without relation to society as it exists to-day, that it must be brought about by a change for which society is wholly unprepared. As Mr. Haywood has said: "The present government of the United States and of the separate states was developed long before socialism was thought of. Even if the workers put a Socialist or proved worth and trust into office, the present government could not possibly become a Socialist government. The wise tailor does not put stitches into rotten cloth."^② It is contended that the extension of government functions are capitalistic in their nature, and do not constitute a step toward Socialism. Mr. B. H. Williams has said: "The transformation from capitalism to co-operative commonwealth can be brought about only by forming the structure of a new society within the authority of the old, that is, by building up an organized form of the industrial commonwealth within the framework of capitalist society. There is no other way than this, and those who imagine that the capitalist class will peaceably or otherwise surrender their interests to an unorganized working class are hugging a dangerous delusion. On the other hand, that the capitalist

class will refuse to surrender them to an industrially organized working class is inconceivable, whether or not the working class is in possession of the government machinery of the capitalists state."⁽¹⁰⁾ On the above principles hinges the vital difference between the so called practical Socialism of the political opportunist and the genuinely revolutionary tactics of the I. W. W. Under the Socialists' program the new society cannot be organized within the social order of the present day. So much then for the I. W. W. criticisms of Socialism.

The I. W. W. opposes trade unionism upon the grounds that it is compromising with the capitalists who are the natural enemies of the working class, and because it is not organized in such a way as to best represent the interests of the workers. Organization by craft unions brings it about that several separate and distinct unions exist within the same industry. The result is that under collective bargaining each craft makes its own terms with the employer. By a system of contracts so cunningly arranged as to cover different periods, the employer is able to frustrate any attempt at a united action on the part of his employees. Furthermore, by granting the demands of one craft union, the employer may make it impossible for another craft union in the same industry to carry on a successful strike. In short, the employer is able to play one union against another and to make his employees fight his battles and win his victories. Then too, the craft unions have never succeeded in organizing the unskilled workmen. They represent the aristocracy of labor

who hold their enviable position by capitalizing their skill just as the employer holds his up by capitalizing his business ability. It is the great mass of unskilled labor that forms the basis of the present social structure. On their shoulders, rests the industrial burden of the present day. They are beaten down and trampled under foot by capitalists and craft unionists alike, and in craft unionism there is no hope for their betterment. The I. W. W. advocates the organization of an industrial union. Such union would be broad enough to include every laborer in the industry from the salaried manager down to the poorest messenger boy. It would represent a democracy of labor. It would set the laborers as a class definitely against the employers as a class, and the buffer of the unskilled would cease to exist. Thus the unskilled and the skilled worker would be brought together in a union that would stand for the betterment of both. Such a union would make no contracts with the employer. They would dictate the terms of employment and it would be possible, if their terms were refused, to absolutely stop production.

Perhaps the strongest craft unions are the organizations of railroad employees. There are many such, and it frequently happens that when one union is on strike, the others will remain at work, and we have the anomaly of union engineers hauling trains officered by strike breaking conductors. It is pointed out that if the railroad men were drawn into an industrial union such conditions would be impossible. The strike of one would be a strike of all, and the position of the employees would be strengthened accordingly.

Of course, we must recognise that the Syndicalist strike is rather different in theory and practice than is the strike of a trade union. The points of difference will be discussed in the next chapter of this thesis.

Throughout all Syndicalist philosophy there runs a strong influence of Anarchy. This is probably less powerful in the United States than in Europe. Everything that makes for organization and which makes the will of the individual subservient to the will of the majority is a step away from Anarchism. In as much as the I. W. W. stands for a stronger and more centralized organization than do the Syndicalous organizations of either France or England, it is less in sympathy with the Anarchistic view. However, the I. W. W. and Anarchism have this in common: They regard the evil of present day society not as the working out of economic law but as the working out of the innate viciousness of the capitalists. The Socialist's doctrine of the economic interpretation of history and the inevitability of present day conditions means nothing to them. This manifestation itself in the spirit of revenge is foreign at least to the theory of Socialist activities.

Thus far, we have considered, for the most part, the theory of the I. W. W. movement as it has been advanced by the leading writers and thinkers. There is another side to the story, and there is another type of literature that must be considered. The movement as it is presented by the theorists is rather different from the movement as it comes close to the workers. Here we have the hatred of the movement couched in telling phrases. Here we have pictured the con-

ditions against which the I. W. W. protests. Here we have the appeal for solidarity of the workers, and the application of the propaganda to the specific industries. As I have said, the I. W. W. does not believe in the economic interpretation of history. They trace the evils of present day society to the individuals who are in control of present day industry; and it is against these as individuals and as a class that the voice of the I. W. W. is raised. Perhaps this may be better understood by a consideration of the I. W. W. attitude towards war. As they see it, there is no quarrel between the workers of the different nations, and whoever wins it is the workers who must pay the price of blood and gold, and it is the workers who will profit least from the result of the hostilities. War is a propaganda of capitalism; it is fomented by capitalists; it is directed by capitalists; the benefits are reaped by capitalists. The soldier is a traitor to his class, and the hirling of its oppressors. Here is a sample of the literature on this subject:

"American capitalists want war with Japan in order to sieze the rich Manchurian lands; gain railway, mining and other concessions; unlock their surplus stock of shoddy goods upon the government; secure investment for their money in interest bearing forms; and to kill off the surplus of the unemployed workers who are threatening to overthrow the capitalist system. Japanese capitalists want war for just about the same reasons. Even if they lose they win."

"Let those who own the country do the fighting!"

"Put the wealthiest in the front ranks, the middle class next! Follow these with judges, lawyers, preachers and politicians. Let the workers remain at home and enjoy what they have produced. Follow a declaration of war with an immediate call for a general strike. Make the slogan: 'Rebellion Sooner Than War.' Don't make yourself a target in order to fatten Rockefeller, Carnegie, the Rothschilds, Guggenheim and the other industrial pirates."⁽¹¹⁾

Such is the appeal that is being made to the workers, and there is enough of truth in it to make it acceptable to many who read it. Whether or not this literature tells the whole story is not the question; it illustrates the attitude of many of the workers toward the leaders of the industrial society of to-day.

In its relations to politics and political parties, the I. W. W. has sought to find the true basis of power and to organize in such a way as to bring that power into its own hands. The "Preamble" says nothing about political activity, except to state the determination of the organization to have no relations with the political parties of the present day. The "Preamble" represents fundamentals, and states only the things wherein it is necessary for all members to agree if there is to be an effective organization.

Mr. St. John, the Secretary of the organization, has said: "Neither will the I. W. W. carry on a propaganda against political action. To do so would be as useless as

^{11/}Smith, W. C., "War and the Workers."

to carry on a campaign for it."⁽¹²⁾ And Mr. Ebert sums up the political attitude of the society thus: "One of the first principles of the Industrial Workers of the World is that political power rests on economic power; that is, the control of the means whereby men live, such as their jobs, for instance. The capitalists control the government of every country where capitalism exists, because they control the land, machinery, finances, etc., on which the people of those countries depend for existence."⁽¹³⁾ The proposition that political power rests on economic power seems to me thoroughly sound; and the failure to recognize this fact has been the weakness in the policy of the many labor parties that have had a brief political career in the past. It is the inherent weakness of the Socialist party of to-day."

"This organization aims to build up the framework of a new society within the shell of the old." Such is the oft repeated phrase of the Syndicalist, and it means just this: The I. W. W. aims to replace present day government, not to control it. Political action is passing, revolutionary action is permanent. In the new society, the legislation now formulated in legislatures will come into being in the mootings of the I. W. W. convention. The subsidiary legislation will be the rules laid down by the locals for the government of their respective industries. Now the organization of a new society is essentially political if one uses

¹²/St. John, "Political Parties and the I. W. W."

¹³/Ebert, J., "Is the I. W. W. Anti-political?"

political to refer to the science of government rather than to the management of the agencies of government. In this sense the I. W. W. is a political organization, but as such it is very different from the mere vote getting parties of capitalist society.

Between the I. W. W. and the American Federation of Labor there is a great deal of bitterness. The I. W. W. declares that an injury to one is an injury to all, and this policy is at odds with the trade union principle, whereby one union will remain at work while another union in the same industry is on strike. To the I. W. W. such action is scabbing of an even worse type than that of the out and out non-unionist; for the American Federation of Labor has the organization which the non-unionist lacks. Here is what one I. W. W. leaflet has to say about it:

"During a very bitterly fought molder's strike in a northern city, the writer noticed one of the prettiest illustrations of the workings of plain scabbing and union scabbing.

"Adense mass of strikers and sympathizers had assembled in front of the factory awaiting the exit of the strike-breakers. On they came, scabs and unionists in one dark mass. Stones, rotten eggs and other missels began to fly, when one of the strikebreakers leaped on a store box and shouted frantically: 'Stop it! Stop it! For ---'s sake stop it! You are hitting more unionists than scabs; you can't tell the difference.'

That's it; whenever scabs and union men work harmoniously in strike breaking industry, all hell can't tell

the difference."⁽¹⁴⁾

Here is another example: "There are three kinds of scabs--the professional, the amateur, and the union scab. The Union scab receives less pay than the professional scab, works better than the amateur scab, and don't know that he is a scab."⁽¹⁵⁾

When a trade unionist asks for recognition of his union, he means recognition as a bargaining and contracting body. As the I. W. W. does not want to bargain or contract they have no use for that kind of recognition. Their organization is recognized every time there is an arrest of one of their agitators, every time there is a scare head in the Sunday Paper, every time they are attacked by the mob, or by the officers of the law.

⁽¹⁴⁾Ameringer, O., "Union Scabs and Others."

⁽¹⁵⁾Stirton, H. M. "Getting Recognition."

IV

The weapons of the I. W. W.

The I. W. W. has two powerful weapons-- the general strike and sabotage. I will first consider the general strike. It may be limited to the industry, it may include the entire community, or it may be nation wide.^① It presupposes the organization of powerful industrial unions. It means that production absolutely ceases. The first two phases have been tried repeatedly by the I. W. W. and with considerable success. The third type which would tie up the industry of the whole nation is the great end and aim of the I. W. W. movement. Through this strike the workers will sieze the industry of the nation and will proceed to organize the industrial commonwealth. Between the general strike in the single industry or even in a single community, and the craft union strike as we know it, there is little difference. Both have in view a definite end to be obtained, usually some specific improvement in working conditions. The craft unions have been carrying on strikes for the recognition of the union, hoping thereby to gain the privilege of collective bargaining. The I. W. W. is not especially interested in collective bargaining, for contracts of any kind hamper its freedom and are abhorrent to its principles. They would present their demands and insist that the employer grant them. If he did, and later refused to live up to them, it would simply mean

^①Haywood, "Industrial Socialism" page 47.

that the I. W. W. would formulate new demands and would call another strike to enforce them. In dealing with the I. W. W. the employer has no assurance of permanency of terms. Industrial unionists insist that bargaining is purely a matter of power and that the most powerful party to the bargain can dictate the terms of labor. Many of the I. W. W. strikes are simply to test this power and to show the employers in what measure the unionists have the ability to tie up industry and stop production. Mr. Haywood has explained the Syndicalist strike on these unique grounds: When a capitalist finds an investment unprofitable, he withdraws his financial support. That is what the workers do in a general strike. When the conditions of labor are such that the workers find that it is not to their interest to continue in the industry, they withdraw the labor which they are investing in the product and set forth the terms which would tempt them to further effort.

The nation wide strike is as yet pure theory; if no one can say it would work, at least, no one can be sure that it would not work. It would depend largely upon the strength of the industrial organizations. To make it successful, it would be necessary to control only the basic industries. If the I. W. W. gets control of mining and transportation, most of the present day industry would be at its mercy. If the organizations were sufficiently strong it would be likely that the general strike would be very short.

In practice, the Syndicalist strike seems to depend for its success or failure on the weakness or strength of the craft unions in the particular industry affected. The

first great campaign of the I. W. W. was in and around Goldfield, Nevada, and lasted during the most of the years 1906 and 1907. Concerning the results of this agitation Mr. Vincent St. John has said: "Under the I. W. W. sway in Goldfield, the minimum wage for all kinds of labor was \$4.50 per day and the eight hour day was universal. The highest point of efficiency for any labor organization was reached by the I. W. W. and W. F. M. in Goldfield, Nevada. No committees were ever sent to any employer. The unions adopted ware scales and regulated hours. The Secretary posted the same on a bulletin board outside of the union hall, and it was LAW. The employers were forced to come and see the union's committees."²⁾ Mr. John Graham Brooks in commenting on this series of strikes says that the strikers "claim to have secured eight hours and \$4.50 per day."³⁾ Mr. Brooks seems to place little faith in the I. W. W. reports of strikes. It is likely that the reviews of labor struggles will be colored by the prejudices of the writers, whether they be Syndicalists, capitalists, or even economists. The fact is that only one who is familiar with the inner working of the organizations of both capitalists and laborers can truly value the results of a strike. As yet, that point of vantage has not been reached by those who write reports. To return to the statement made at the beginning of this paragraph: In and around Goldfield the craft unions were pitifully weak and inefficient, and the I. W. W. won a certain measure of success.

2) St. John, "The I. W. W." page 20.

3) Brooks, "American Syndicalism" page 246.

A strike beginning in July 1909 at McKees Rocks, Pennsylvania, lasted eleven weeks and involved about eight thousand workers. Here again there was no effective craft unions and the attitude of the operators was dictatorial in the extreme. During this strike the I. W. W. came into sharp conflict with the Pennsylvania State Constabulary, and several were killed on both sides. This Constabulary seems to have had a record of extreme brutality in their dealings with strikers, and the I. W. W. was the first organization to successfully oppose them. Mr. Vincent St. John says that the strike was an entire success.⁴⁾

The strike of the Textile Workers⁵⁾ in 1912 at Lawrence Massachusetts, involved some twenty-nine thousand workers, and it is likely that those indirectly affected would bring the number near sixty thousand. The strike was successful. During its progress there were 333 arrests, and of these 320 were convicted. Out of this strike grew the famous trial of Ettor and Giovanitti, a trial that was disgrace to the intelligence of the operators and the prosecuting attorney alike; for the charge was farfetched, and calculated to arouse general sympathy for the accused. Here again there was no craft organization worth mentioning.

It is interesting to note that, though the slogan of all Syndicalist strikes is "No compromise with the employers", yet there always is a compromise. And the conferences of the I. W. W. representatives are no different

4) St. John, "The I. W. W" page 22.

5) St. John, "The I. W. W" page 25.

in nature from those conducted by the well organized craft unions. In the very nature of things, conference and compromise are bound to exist. All industrial relations must finally hark back to an agreement between one or more representatives of the interested parties; except in the nation wide, general strike, the I. W. W. must follow the precedent of all labor organizations; it must formulate its demands, and secure such part of them as it can. Now such compromise is regularly a part of the program of the craft unions, and it seems but natural that the workers should prefer to treat with their employers through old and established craft unions rather than through the newer industrial unions if the industry is sufficiently organized to make such procedure possible. The successes of the I. W. W., then, are more likely to be found in the industries in which the craft unions are weak or nonexistent, and in those industries in which there has developed an extreme hostility between the employer and the employees.

In some cities, the I. W. W. has carried on long and bitter struggles to secure the enjoyment of the Constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech. This has been most bitterly contested in Spokane, Washington; and in Fresno, California. In both instances the I. W. W. was successful in obtaining the right to hold street meetings.^(b) Perhaps the victory was due less to the activity of the I. W. W. than to the general feeling that the action of the city officials had been exaggerated, the contrary to the policy of the

^b St. John "The I. W. W" page 22.

American People.

The financing of strikes is becoming a serious problem to the I. W. W. The membership is made up of workers in the worst paid industries of the nation; there is no general fund, and strike benefits are hard to collect for the members simply have^{not} the money to pay with. In the greater struggles there have been large contributions from sources outside of the union, and these may, probably, be counted on in the future; but in the smaller strikes the problem is serious. It may lead to an increased advocacy of sabotage, and the intermittent strike, that is, a system of annoyance rather than a system of open warfare.⁽¹⁾ It is estimated that, in 1912, \$101,504.05 was expended in handling strikes. A total of 75,152 workers and their families were involved, and the strike period aggregated seventy-four weeks.⁽²⁾

The second of the weapons of the I. W. W. is sabotage. This means in substance, the return of bad work for bad pay. It is practiced by destroying the product or by tampering with the machinery in such a way that production is impossible. It is a form of strike in which the workers give up their jobs and yet keep them too. They continue to produce but they render the results of their labor worthless to the capitalist employers. In the meantime, their wages go on, and strike benefits are unnecessary. The amount of injury and loss which has been inflicted in this way is remarkable, and the skillful worker who is familiar with the

1/ "On the Firing Line" page 20.

2/ St. John "The I. W. W." page 25.

technique of the industry can practice sabotage with little danger of discovery. Especially is this true if the other workers are in league with him. During a recent railroad strike in Paris, sabotage was practiced in this way: Cars loaded with perishable goods were misdirected, and allowed to stand on sidings until the consignment had become worthless. Goods that were directed to Paris were passed through the city and buried in the freight yards of some of the smaller towns, and the labels on the packages were destroyed. The confusion caused was enormous, and the railroad officers were unable to find the guilty parties.

The Syndicalists justify this form of warfare on the ground that it is but returning like for like--bad work for bad pay. The result to the public is the same as if production were entirely halted, and the loss in wages and material must be born by the employers. However the practice of sabotage has not been common in this country. Perhaps there is a general feeling even among the Syndicalists that the destruction of the product is an injury to society and to themselves as a part of society, even though it may be the means of gaining certain demands which they have made on the employer. Perhaps, too, the struggles of the I. W. W. to date have not been such as would make sabotage effective. Though there may be at times justification of its use, in general, it is a sneaking method of warfare and is not calculated to appeal to the manhood of the American worker.

The excessive use of sabotage might come to have a very deleterious effect upon labor as a class. The end of

all industrial endeavor is production. The ideal of Syndicalist society is production as efficient as that of to-day but under happier conditions. The propaganda of the I. W. W. is intended to train the worker for membership in that new society, and to train him to destroy is a poor preparation for future industrial harmony. If, in the new society, disagreement should arise, the same destructive methods might be used by both parties to the material injury of society as a whole. The Socialists regard all direct action as likely to have this unfortunate effect. Mr. Hilquit has said in speaking of direct action: "The policy of breaking the law has invariably served to demoralize the movement by attracting criminals to it."^① Perhaps by use of sabotage criminals would not only be attracted but would also be developed within the movement itself.

This brings us to the subject of Violence and its relations to the labor movement. Violence may be of two kinds, either to property or to persons. On the first score the conscience of the I. W. W. is at ease. The property of the stubborn employer they regard as their lawful prey. It represents wealth that has been stolen from them; it is truly theirs, even though the law does not recognize their ownership of it. It is theirs to enjoy or destroy according as they can or cannot get peaceful possession of it. But violence to persons is another matter. Such violence may be of a persuasive character--that is, the great end is to get all the workers to unite for the common good of all. Some can be

^①Hilquit in the "New York Call" Nov. 20, 1911.

persuaded by soft words, some by cold facts; but some can only understand reason expressed in brick-bats and bullets. The I. W. W. very frankly uses the method that seems most likely to appeal to the type of person with whom they are dealing. In several of the greater labor disputes such as the Miner's Strike in Colorado in 1903-04 and the still more recent strike in 1913, a situation has been developed that had all the stress and hate of actual warfare. The violence from such disputes has arisen from the natural tendency of a man to fight when he is in desperate circumstances rather than from the theory or propaganda of any organization.

Violence has been practiced against the I. W. W. members in about as large a measure as it has been practiced by them. It has been carried on by the police forces of cities in which the I. W. W. representatives have been refused free speech. It has been carried on by armed guards hired by the employers who have been permitted to commit acts that would not be tolerated if committed by a striker. It has been carried on by capitalists who have refused to obey laws favorable to labor after they have been written into the statutes of the state or nation. It has been carried on by state officials who have refused to enforce the laws advantageous to the workers. The actions of such capitalist owners and politicians are just as truly the breaking of the law and just as truly violence as are the actions of the saboteur. There is little choice between the mine owner who kills a workman by using a machine not protected according to law, and the striker who slugs a man who has come to take his job.

In any case, violence is an unfortunate phenomenon which is likely to arise whenever feeling runs high, whether it be in labor matters or in connection with some other disagreement. In the long run, it is an injury to both parties to the quarrel and is an injury to society as a whole. It has always been present in labor disputes and it is likely that it will continue. It is to be regretted and avoided in so far as it is possible.

V

The Future of the Movement.

The final goal of the organization of the I. W. W. is one big union. All the workers drawn together in one mammoth society is the ultimate aim, but the I. W. W. leaders are not foolish enough to think that such an organization will bring unity of thought or of ideals. Factions have existed and do exist and there is no reason to believe that they will ever cease to exist. Ever since its inception, the I. W. W. has been the battle ground of the Socialists, Anarchists, and Trade Unionists. This factionalism has been the weakness of the organization and it has also been its strength; though not entirely of either, it partakes of all. The "Preamble" is a statement of basic principles which the I. W. W. leaders regard as fundamental and necessary before any permanent organization can be formulated. These principles represent a compromise of the extreme propaganda of the various warring factions. But outside the matters told within the "Preamble", there are many subjects of dispute. As the organization grows and extends, new subjects of dispute arise and will continue to arise. It is the hope of the leaders of the movement that holding firmly to the principles of the "Preamble", they may be able to find a way of harmonizing the many factions interested in these secondary elements of organization. In every convention there has arisen one or more subjects of serious disagreement. At present this indicates the live and growing

organization, but if it is to continue it may disrupt the society. Furthermore it may mean that the co-operative commonwealth of the future will be split into parties even as it has the capitalistic commonwealth of to-day. These questions which are at present local and economical will be replaced in the future by questions that are final and political. Whether or not political division will come to threaten the existence of the co-operative commonwealth is an open question. At least there is danger in such developement. Thus the great problem of the I. W. W. is to harmonize the elements present in its organization and to lay a strong foundation of unity as a basis of the social structure they hope to raise.

Up to date the I. W. W. has flourished only amid scenes of storm and strike. Wherever there is industrial peace and well organized craft unions, it has been difficult for the I. W. W. to gain a foot hold. This is in part due to the opposition of the American Federation of Labor and to its rejection of many of the principles of Syndicalist platform. In part too, it is due to the fact that the American workingman under tolerable conditions is a conservative, peaceful, individual and is not likely to give ear to the appeal of an organization that professes frankly to be revolutionary. It is by those who are unskilled, uneducated, and who are forced to labor under intolerable conditions that the I. W. W. is welcome. It is among such that its most valuable work is being done. Whether or not it will ever be able to hold the great mass of the working people is a question that the future must decide. If industrial conditions remain as they are to-day, it seems likely that the loyalty

of the workingmen will be to the craft unions. But we are not sure that conditions will remain the same. Unskilled labor is playing a larger part in production than it has ever done before. New inventions and new methods are being continually introduced which tend to augment the practice of unskilled laborers employed and to diminish the value of the skilled craftsman. If such progress continues it may be that the industries of the future will be dominated by the unskilled and the allegiance of these would naturally be to the industrial rather than the trade or craft unions.

The employers themselves are coming to recognize the I. W. W. as a power that must be dealt with in the future. It has seemed to thrive on the oppression to which it has been subjected and some men prominent in the industrial world are beginning to fear that this movement may come to dominate our entire industrial society. Mr. R. W. Babson, the most prominent advisor of mercantile and financial practitioners has said: "The Industrial Workers of the World state frankly that ultimately there can be but one head--either capital or labor must rule--and that we are to see a fight to the finish. I regret to admit it, but I nevertheless believe that the I. W. W. theory is the more correct, and many great manufacturers reluctantly agree."^① There is no doubt but that a strong organization of unskilled workers is far more difficult to deal with than is an equally strong organization of skilled workmen. The former represents a more irresponsible part of the labor world. Its members have nothing to lose and everything to gain and a method for getting it. The

general public knows the I. W. W. chiefly through the newspaper reports of its spectacular procedure. To many these letters are a mystic symbol which stands for dynamite, bombs, and bloody street fights. The idea that the I. W. W. has a definite plan of social reconstruction is foreign to the minds of most of the people.

Perhaps it is because the general public has taken so little interest in the theories of the I. W. W. that the program has not been more definitely formulated. It seems likely that as the organization becomes more prominent and is a more common subject of conversation, the program of the organization will be more fully developed and will be brought to the unity which it does not possess to-day. The principles of the organization as sketched in the "Preamble" are not new. They have been discussed and criticized by economists through many volumes. In general they have been declared falacies as have also most of the principles of Socialism, but the decision of the Economists is not final and it may be that the public will decide to determine by trial whether or not these principles can be used as the foundation of a society in which it will be desirable to live.

It has been said that the I. W. W. has two problems. First, how to build a union that will be effective for a general strike, and second, how to prepare the workers for their future mission of taking and holding the product of their labor and of administering all such institutions as are necessary to their end.^① As yet neither problem has been solved. In the nature of things, neither can be solved for

¹ Trautmann, "Handbook of Industrial Unionism" page 10.

many years to come. The general strike is so broad and comprehensive that a long preparation is necessary, and to unify industrial society to such an extent as will make a co-operative commonwealth possible will be the work of generations rather than of years. If the I. W. W. can hold its place in the industrial world it may in time solve these problems. Its present organization is of a nature that can be changed to suit the needs of a changing industrial society and certainly no one can accuse its members of a conservatism that will prevent their adopting such changes that will bring them the largest measure of influence and power.

Bibliography.

- Brooks, John Graham "American Syndicalism"
Macmillan Company, New York, 1913.
- Harley, J. H. "Syndicalism"
Dodge Publishing Company, New York.
- Spargo, John "Syndicalism, Industrial Unionism and
Socialism" B. W. Huebsch, New York, 1913.
- Spargo and Arner "Elements of Socialism"
Macmillan Company, New York, 1912.
- Hilquit, Morris "Socialism in Theory and Practice"
Macmillan Company, New York, 1913.
- Walling, W. E. "Socialism As It Is"
Macmillan Company, New York.
- Ebert, Justus "The Trial of a New Society"
I. W. W. Publishing Bureau, Cleveland, Ohio.
- Senate Document 870 "Report on Strike of Textile Workers
at Lawrence, Massachusetts in 1912."
- Haywood, W. D. and Bohn, Frank "Industrial Socialism"
Chas. H. Kerr & Company, Chicago, 1911.
- Hunter, Robt. "Violence and the Labor Movement."
Macmillan Company, New York, 1914.
- American Economic Review, Vol. IV, No.1, Supplement
March 1914.
- Tridon, A. "The New Unionism"
I. W. W. Publishing Bureau, Cleveland, Ohio.

Pamphlets.

St. John, Vincent "The I. W. W., Its History, Structure,
and Methods"

Constitution and By Laws of the I. W. W.

General Executive Board. Extracts from report 1912

"On the Firing Line" The Industrial Workers, Spokane,
Washington.

Lewis, Austin "Proletarian and Petit-Bourgeois"
Industrial Workers of the World, Chicago.

Ettor, Joseph J. "Industrial Unionism"

I. W. W. Publishing Bureau, Cleveland, Ohio.

Woodruff, Abner E. "The Advancing Proletariat"

I. W. W. Publishing Bureau, Cleveland, Ohio.

Koettgen, Ewald "One Big Union"

I. W. W. Publishing Bureau, Cleveland, Ohio.

Williams, B. H. "Eleven Blind Leaders"

I. W. W. Publishing Bureau, New Castle, Pa.

Trautmann, William E. "Handbook of Industrial Unionism"

"Why Strikes are Lost; How to Win", "One Big Union"

I. W. W. Publishing Bureau, Cleveland, Ohio.

"Ettor and Giovanitti Before the Jury at Salem, Massachusetts,
November 23, 1912."

The Industrial Workers of the World, Chicago.

"I. W. W. Songs"

I. W. W. Publishing Bureau, Cleveland, Ohio, 1914.

Leaflets

Ameringer, Oscar "Union Scabs and Others"

Ebert, Justus "Is the I. W. W. Anti-political?"

Nelson, E. S. "Appeal to Wage Workers, Men and Women."

Smith, W. C. "War and the Workers"

St. John, Vincent "Political Parties and the I. W. W."

"Why the A. F. of L. Cannot Become an
Industrial Union."

Stirton, A. M. "Getting Recognition"

Walquist, August "Eight Hour Work Day"

"Lake and Marine Workers, A Few Words To You"

All published by the I. W. W. Publishing Bureau,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Magazines and Papers

"The International Socialist Review"

Journal of Political Economy, Vol. 21, A. Tridon,

"New Unionism"

Nation, Vol. 198, R. Hunter,

"Violence and the Labor Movement"

Contemporary Review, Vol. 105, J. H. Harley,

"Syndicalism and the Labor Situation"

"Solidarity" I. W. W. Publishing Bureau, Cleveland, Ohio.

Appendix A

The Industrial Union Manifesto.

-***-

Issued by Conference of Industrial Unionists at Chicago,
January 2, 3 and 4, 1905.

Social relations and groupings only reflect mechanical and industrial conditions. The great facts of present industry are the displacement of human skill by machines and the increase of capitalist power through concentration in the possession of the tools with which wealth is produced and distributed.

Because of these facts trade divisions among laborers and competition among capitalists are alike disappearing. Class divisions grow ever more fixed and class antagonisms more sharp. Trade lines have been swallowed up in a common servitude of all workers to the machines which they tend. New machines, ever replacing less productive ones, wipe out whole trades and plunge new bodies of workers into the ever-growing army of tradeless, hopeless unemployed. As human beings and human skill are displaced by mechanical progress, the capitalists need use the workers only during that brief period when muscles and nerve respond most intensely. The moment the laborer no longer yields the maximum of profits he is thrown upon the scrap pile, to starve alongside the discarded machine. A dead line has been drawn, and an age limit established, to cross which, in this world of monopolized opportunities, means condemnation to industrial death.

The worker, wholly separated from the land and the

tools, with his skill of craftsmanship rendered useless, is sunk in the uniform mass of wage slaves. He sees his power of resistance broken by class divisions, perpetuated from outgrown industrial stages. His wages constantly grow less as his hours grow longer and monopolized prices grow higher. Shifted hither and thither by the demands of profit-takers the laborer's home no longer exists. In this helpless condition he is forced to accept whatever humiliating conditions his master may impose. He is submitted to a physical and intellectual examination more searching than was the chattel slave when sold from the auction block. Laborers are no longer classified by difference in trade skill, but the employer assigns them according to the machines to which they are attached. These divisions, far from representing differences in skill or interests among the laborers, are imposed by the employers that workers may be pitted against one another and spurred to greater exertion in the shop, and that all resistance to capitalist tyranny may be weakened by artificial distinctions.

While encouraging these outgrown divisions among the workers the capitalists carefully adjust themselves to the new conditions. They wipe out all differences among themselves and present a united front in their war upon labor. Through employer's associations, they seek to crush with brutal force, by the injunctions of the judiciary, and the use of military power, all efforts at resistance. Or when the other policy seems more profitable, they conceal their daggers beneath the Civic Federation and hoodwink and betray

those whom they would rule and exploit. Both methods depend for success upon the blindness and internal dissensions of the working class. The Employers' line of battle and methods of warfare correspond to the solidarity of the mechanical and industrial concentration, while laborers still form their fighting organizations on lines of long-gone trade divisions. The battles of the past emphasize this lesson. The textile workers of Lowell, Philadelphia and Fall River; the butchers of Chicago, weakened by the disintegrating effects of trade divisions; the machinists on the Santa Fe, unsupported by their fellow-workers subject to the same masters; the long-struggling miners of Colorado, hampered by lack of unity and solidarity upon the industrial battlefield, all bear witness to the helplessness and impotency of labor as at present organized.

This worn-out and corrupt system offers no promise of improvement and adaptation. There is no silver lining to the clouds of darkness and despair settling down upon the world of labor.

This system offers only a perpetual struggle for slight relief from wage slavery. It is blind to the possibility of establishing an industrial democracy, wherein there shall be no wage slavery, but where the workers will own the tools which they operate, and the product of which they alone should enjoy.

It shatters the ranks of the workers into fragments, rendering them helpless and impotent on the industrial battlefield.

Separation of craft from craft renders industrial and financial solidarity impossible.

Union men scab upon union men; hatred of worker for worker is engendered, and the workers are delivered helpless and disintegrated into the hands of the capitalists.

Craft jealousy leads to the attempt to create trade monopolies.

Prohibitive initiation fees are established that force men to become scabs against their will. Men whom manliness circumstances have driven from one trade are thereby fined when they seek to transfer membership to the union of a new craft.

Craft divisions foster political ignorance among the workers, thus dividing their class at the ballot box, as well as in the shop, mine and factory.

Craft unions may be and have been used to assist employers in the establishment of monopolies and the raising of prices. One set of workers are thus used to make harder the conditions of life of another body of laborers.

Craft divisions hinder the growth of class consciousness of the workers, foster the idea of harmony of interests between employing exploiter and employed slave. They permit the association of the misleaders of the workers with the capitalists in the Civic Federations, where plans are made for the perpetuation of capitalism, and the permanent enslavement of the workers through the wage system.

Previous efforts for the betterment of the working class have proven abortive because limited in scope and dis-

connected in action.

Universal economic evils afflicting the working class can be eradicated only by a universal working class movement. Such a movement of the working class is impossible while separate craft and wage agreements are made favoring the employer against other crafts in the same industry, and while energies are wasted in fruitless jurisdiction struggles which serve only to further the personal aggrandizement of union officials.

A movement to fulfill these conditions must consist of one great industrial union embracing all industries--providing for craft autonomy locally, industrial autonomy internationally, and working class unity generally.

It must be founded on the class struggle, and its general administration must be conducted in harmony with the recognition of the irrepressible conflict between the capitalist class and the working class.

It should be established as the economic organization of the working class, without affiliation with any political party.

All power should rest in a collective membership.

Local, national and general administration, including union labels, buttons, badges, transfer cards, initiation fees and per capita tax should be uniform throughout.

All members must hold membership in the local, national or international union covering the industry in which they are employed, but transfers of membership between unions, local national or international, should be universal.

Workingmen bringing union cards from industrial unions in foreign countries should be freely admitted into the organization.

The general administration should issue a publication representing the entire union and its principles which should reach all members in every industry at regular intervals.

A central defense fund, to which all members contribute equally, should be established and maintained.

All workers therefore, who agree with the principles herein set forth, will meet in convention at Chicago the 27th day of June, 1905, for the purpose of forming an economic organization of the working class along the lines marked out in this manifesto.

Appendix B.

The Preamble to the Constitution of the I. W. W.

The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace so long as hunger and want are found among millions of working people, and the few who make up the employing class, have all the good things of life.

Between these two classes a struggle must go on until the workers of the world organize as a class, take possession of the earth and the machinery of production, and abolish the wage system.

We find that the centering of the management of industries into fewer and fewer hands makes the trade unions unable to cope with the ever growing power of the employing class. The trade unions foster a state of affairs which allows one set of workers to be pitted against another set of workers in the same industry, thereby helping defeat one another in wage wars. Moreover, the trade unions aid the employing class to mislead the workers into the belief that the working class have interests in common with their employers.

These conditions can be changed and the interest of the working class upheld only by an organization formed in such a way that all its members in any one industry, or in all industries, if necessary, cease work whenever a strike or lockout is on in any department thereof, thus making an injury to one an injury to all.

Instead of the conservative motto, "A fair day's

wages for a fair day's work," we must inscribe on our banner the revolutionary watchword, "Abolition of the wage system."

It is the historic mission of the working class to do away with capitalism. The army of production must be organized, not only for the every day struggle with capitalists, but also to carry on production when capitalism shall have been overthrown. By organizing industrially we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old.





UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 082198224